arXiv:1606.08966v2 [quant-ph] 19 Jul 2016

Quantum optical metrology in the lossy $SU(2)$ and $SU(1,1)$ interferometers

Yang Gao*
Department of Physics, Xinyang Normal University, Xinyang, Henan 464000, People's Republic of China
(Dated: July 20, 2016)

We study the phase sensitivity in the conventional $SU(2)$ and nonconventional $SU(1,1)$ interferometers with the coherent and squeezed vacuum input state via the quantum Cramer-Rao bound. We explicitly construct the detection scheme that gives the optimal phase sensitivity. For practical purposes, we show that in the presence of photon loss, both interferometers with proper homodyne detections, are nearly optimal. We also find that unlike the coherent state and squeezed vacuum state, the effects of the imperfect detector on the phase sensitivity cannot be asymptotically removed for a generic coherent-squeezed state by increasing the amplifier gain of the OPA before the final detection.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 06.20.Dk, 42.50.Dv, 42.50.St

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, the first direct detection of a gravitational wave has been carried out [1]. The prototype of such a detection is to measure a relative phase shift between the two arms of an interferometer due to passing a gravitational wave. The classical setup is to feed the interferometer with a coherent and vacuum state. The phase sensitivity of this strategy is bounded by the shot-noise limit (SNL) [2]. The SNL *per se* is remarkable enough to accomplish the sensitive detection of a gravitational wave. However, further improvements are still needed for more events.

One task of quantum optical metrology is to find the ultimate limits on the phase sensitivity and the states that achieve these limits [3]. In the absence of photon loss, employing quantum resources such as $N00N$ states and entangled states [4], it is possible to improve the phase sensitivity from the SNL to the Heisenberg limit (HL) [5]. While the nonclassical states give enhanced phase sensitivities, their generations are known to be highly difficult and resource intensive. Moreover, these states with number of photons are very fragile to photon losses. A more practical strategy is using a coherent and squeezed vacuum as the input, which gives better phase sensitivity than the SNL [2, 6, 7]. For an ideal interferometer, the optimality of this strategy is proved in Ref. [7]. Another possibility to beat the SNL is to use the nonconventional interferometer first proposed in Ref. [8], such as the optical-parametric amplifier (OPA)-based interferometer [9].

In this paper, we will use the Gaussian input states to examine their optimal performances in the conventional $SU(2)$ and nonconventional $SU(1,1)$ interferometers. We find that the detection schemes that gives the optimal phase sensitivities can be explicitly constructed based on the quantum Cramer-Rao bounds (QCRB)



FIG. 1: The schematics of (a) $SU(2)$ and (b) $SU(1,1)$ interferometers. There is a π phase difference between the two OPAs. ϕ: relative phase shift between the two arms; M: mirror.

[10, 11], which can be realized by the balanced homodyne detection associated with intensity-intensity correlations [12]. The effects of internal and external photon losses on the phase sensitivity will be investigated. In the presence of the internal loss, we will illustrate that both interferometers with proper homodyne detections, are nearly optimal for practical situations. Especially, the previously known results for the equally lossy $SU(2)$ interferometer are generalized to the unequally lossy case. We will find that the squeezed component of the input state in the lossy $SU(1,1)$ interferometer is effectively unnecessary. It will be also shown that by increasing the amplifier gain of the OPA before the final detection, the effects of the detector inefficiency on the phase sensitivity cannot be asymptotically removed for a generic coherent-squeezed state, except for the coherent state [13] and the squeezed vacuum state [14].

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section II we review the QCRB with the Gaussian states, and

*Electronic address: gaoyangchang@outlook.com

construct the relevant operators (describing the detection scheme) that could hit the QCRB. Some examples for the phase sensitivity in the $SU(2)$ interferometer are discussed in Section III. Section IV contains some examples in the $SU(1,1)$ interferometer. Then we consider the effects of the detection inefficiency on the QCRB in Section V. Finally, we end with a short conclusion.

II. QCRB WITH GAUSSIAN STATES AND OPTIMAL DETECTIONS

We suppose that the phase shift ϕ is encoded in the output state ρ of the photons, after passing the interferometer. The QCRB sets the ultimate limit for the phase sensitivity $\Delta\phi$ in the quantum optical metrology [3, 10]. It is related to the quantum Fisher information (QFI) F by

$$\Delta\phi \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{F}}. \tag{1}$$

The QFI is given by the variance of the so-called symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) L,

$$F = \Delta^2 L = \langle L^2\rangle, \tag{2}$$

$$\rho' = \frac{1}{2}(\rho L + L\rho), \tag{3}$$

where the notations $\Delta^2 O = \langle (O-\langle O\rangle)^2\rangle$ in terms of $\langle O\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho O]$, and $O' = \partial_\phi O$ for an arbitrary operator. Here the fact $\langle L\rangle = 0$ has been used. The analytical expression or numerical calculation of the QFI usually pose formidable challenges. One exception is for the Gaussian state [11], which is completely characterized by the mean vector $\mathbf{v}$ and covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. For two-mode Gaussian state with annihilation operators a_1 and a_2, we have

$$\mathbf{v} = \langle \mathbf{a}\rangle, \quad \mathbf{\Sigma} = \langle (\tilde{\mathbf{a}}\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top)\rangle, \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{a}^\top = (a_1, a_1^\dagger, a_2, a_2^\dagger)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{v}$, and $(\cdot)$ means the symmetrized ordering product. The SLD and QFI for the Gaussian state in the matrix forms are given by [11],

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{a}} - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{A}] + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top \mathbf{b} \\ F &= \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{\Sigma}'\mathbf{A}] + \mathbf{v}'^\top \mathbf{b}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the matrix elements are

$$\mathbf{A}_{jk} = \frac{1}{2}[(\mathbf{\Sigma}\otimes\mathbf{\Sigma} + \mathbf{\Omega}\otimes\mathbf{\Omega}/4)^{-1}]_{jk,pq}\mathbf{\Sigma}'_{pq} \tag{6}$$

in terms of $\mathbf{\Omega}_{jk} = [\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{a}_k]$, and the vector is $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{v}'$. Here the direct-product of two arbitrary matrices A and B is defined by $(A\otimes B)_{jk,pq} = A_{jp}B_{kq}$.

Since the QCRB for the phase sensitivity is asymptotically attainable for a large number of repeated measurements, it is imperative to specify a detection scheme that could achieve the QCRB. For the Gaussian state, we take the detection scheme as

$$M = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top \mathbf{A}_0\tilde{\mathbf{a}} + \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{b}_0, \tag{7}$$

where the matrix $\mathbf{A}_0$ and the vector $\mathbf{b}_0$ can be freely chosen for our purpose. The detection signal is thus given by $\langle M\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{A}_0]/2 + \mathbf{v}^\top\mathbf{b}_0$. The rate of this signal change as a function of phase is

$$\partial_\phi\langle M\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{\Sigma}'\mathbf{A}_0] + \mathbf{v}'^\top\mathbf{b}_0. \tag{8}$$

Meanwhile, the detection noise is described by $\Delta^2 M = \langle (M-\langle M\rangle)^2\rangle$, where

$$M - \langle M\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top\mathbf{A}_0\tilde{\mathbf{a}} - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{A}_0] + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top\mathbf{b}_0. \tag{9}$$

The phase sensitivity is then estimated as the ration of the detection noise versus the rate of the signal change,

$$\Delta^2\phi = \frac{\Delta^2 M}{|\partial_\phi\langle M\rangle|^2}. \tag{10}$$

Now assuming $\mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{b}_0 = \mathbf{b}$, from Eqs. (5,8,9) we find that $M - \langle M\rangle$ and $\partial_\phi\langle M\rangle$ become the SLD and QFI, respectively. So Eq. (10) takes

$$\Delta^2\phi = \frac{\langle L^2\rangle}{F^2} = \frac{1}{F} \tag{11}$$

for $F = \langle L^2\rangle$. Therefore, the attainability of the QCRB for the Gaussian state is constructively proved.

Compared with the previously known detection schemes such as parity, intensity, intensity difference, homodyne detections and etc., the M-detection could always show the best performance among all possible detections irrespective of photon loss. Though the parity detection gives the optimal sensitivity under the lossless conditions, it suffers greatly under the lossy conditions. Because the quadratic form of the M-detection, its physical realization can be simply implemented by the balanced homodyne detection associated with intensity-intensity correlations according to Ref. [12]. Furthermore, the explicit form of M-detection allows us to assess the performances of other schemes, and shows the way to better detection schemes.

III. PHASE SENSITIVITY IN THE $SU(2)$ INTERFEROMETER

In the traditional Mach-Zehnder interferometer (MZI) [8] as shown in Fig. 1(a), the output signal is very sensitive to the relative phase shift between the two arms. The ability to resolve extremely small relative phase shift finds many applications in optical gyroscopes, gravita-



(a) (b)

FIG. 2: The phase sensitivity in the MZI with a coherent and squeezed vacuum input state. (a) The optimized phase sensitivity over n_s as a function of the total average photon number $n = n_c + n_s$. Dashed: ideal MZI ($\xi = 1$); Solid: lossy MZI ($\xi = 0.8$). (b) The phase sensitivity with the homodyne detection as a function of the average coherent photon number n_c. Dashed: p_2-detection; Solid: M-detection. Here $\xi_1 = 0.8$ and $\xi_2 = 1$.

tional wave detection, quantum imaging and sensing [15]. It is more convenient to use the $SU(2)$ group formalism for this passive lossless four-port optical system. The propagation of photons through the MZI can be described by the composition of three $SU(2)$ transformations $T_{\rm MZI} = T_{\rm BS}T_\phi T_{\rm BS}$: $\mathbf{a} \to T_{\rm MZI}\mathbf{a}$, where

$$T_{\rm BS} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{bmatrix}1&0&1&0\\0&1&0&1\\1&0&-1&0\\0&1&0&-1\end{bmatrix},$$
$$T_\phi = \begin{bmatrix}e^{\frac{i\phi}{2}}&0&0&0\\0&e^{-\frac{i\phi}{2}}&0&0\\0&0&e^{-\frac{i\phi}{2}}&0\\0&0&0&e^{\frac{i\phi}{2}}\end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

where $T_{\rm BS}$ and T_ϕ represent the actions of the beam splitter and the symmetric phase shift [16], respectively. Without the phase shift, $T_{\rm BS}T_{\rm BS} = 1$ and the output is equal to the input.

With a coherent state $|\alpha\rangle_1|0\rangle_2 = e^{\alpha(a_1^\dagger - a_1)}|0\rangle_1|0\rangle_2$ into the MZI, the mean vector and covariance matrix of the input state are

$$\mathbf{v}_{in}^\top = (\alpha,\alpha,0,0),$$
$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_{in} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix}0&1&0&0\\1&0&0&0\\0&0&0&1\\0&0&1&0\end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

After the transformation $T_{\rm MZI}$, the output state is represented by

$$\mathbf{v}_{out} = T_{\rm MZI}\mathbf{v}_{in} = \alpha\left(\cos\frac{\phi}{2}, \cos\frac{\phi}{2}, i\sin\frac{\phi}{2}, -i\sin\frac{\phi}{2}\right)^\top,$$
$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_{out} = T_{\rm MZI}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{in}T_{\rm MZI}^\top = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{in}. \quad (14)$$

For simplicity, we assume that the estimated phase is around $\phi = 0$ from now on. The calculations lead to the QFI $F = \alpha^2$, and the M-detection $M \propto p_2 = i(a_2^\dagger - a_2)/\sqrt{2}$, namely, a homodyne detection. The optimal phase sensitivity is thus the SNL, $\Delta\phi = 1/\sqrt{n_c}$, where $n_c = \alpha^2$ is the average photon number in the coherent beam.

It has been shown that the SNL can be beaten by taking advantage of quantum resources towards achieving the more fundamental HL [5], i.e., $\Delta\phi \simeq 1/n$, where n is the average photon number inside the MZI. Considering the practical difficulty in creating the required quantum resource (such as creating high $N00N$ states, large-gain squeezed light sources), we take the moderate strategy that using a coherent and squeezed vacuum state $|\alpha\rangle_1|0,r\rangle_2 = e^{\alpha(a_1^\dagger - a_1)}e^{r(a_2^{\dagger 2} - a_2^2)/2}|0\rangle_1|0\rangle_2$ as the input [2, 6, 7]. It is described by

$$\mathbf{v}_{in}^\top = (\alpha,\alpha,0,0),$$
$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_{in} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix}0&1&0&0\\1&0&0&0\\0&0&Y&X\\0&0&X&Y\end{bmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

where $X = \cosh 2r$, $Y = \sinh 2r$, and r is the squeezing factor. Then output state is represented by $\mathbf{v}_{out} = T_{\rm MZI}\mathbf{v}_{in}$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{out} = T_{\rm MZI}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{in}T_{\rm MZI}^\top$. The corresponding QFI is given by $F = \alpha^2 e^{2r} + \sinh^2 r$, and the M-detection is

$$M = i\sinh r[(\tilde{a}_1\tilde{a}_2^\dagger - \tilde{a}_1^\dagger\tilde{a}_2)\sinh r + (\tilde{a}_1^\dagger\tilde{a}_2^\dagger - \tilde{a}_1\tilde{a}_2)\cosh r] + i\alpha(1 + 2e^r\sinh r)(a_2^\dagger - a_2). \quad (16)$$

It can be seen that for a given average photon number $n = n_c + n_s = \alpha^2 + \sinh^2 r$, the phase sensitivity reaches the HL at the optimal point $n_c \simeq n_s$. However, due to technical limitations, $n_s \ll n_c$ and $n \approx n_c$, we actually have $\Delta\phi \simeq e^{-r}/\sqrt{n}$, which can still beat the SNL for a positive squeezing factor. Moreover, the M-detection is approximately a homodyne detection $M \propto p_2$.

Next, we consider photon loss to the environment inside the interferometer. It can be modeled by a fictitious beam splitter at the middle of the interferometer arm, which transforms the beam as follows: $a_k \to \mathcal{L}a_k = a_k\sqrt{\xi_k} + v_k\sqrt{1-\xi_k}$ $(k = 1, 2)$, where ξ_k is the photon transmissivity, and v_k is the environment mode in the vacuum state. The actions of $\mathcal{L}$ on the mean vector and covariance matrix take the form of

$$\mathbf{v} \to R\mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{\Sigma} \to R\mathbf{\Sigma}R^\top + \mathbf{\Sigma}_{\rm vac}, \quad (17)$$

where

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \xi_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \xi_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \xi_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\rm vac} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1-\xi_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1-\xi_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-\xi_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1-\xi_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

Using this formalism, the QCRB for a coherent and squeezed vacuum state into the MZI can be obtained. For a coherent state ($r = 0$), it gives the phase sensitivity $\Delta\phi = 1/\sqrt{\xi n_c}$, which is a constant factor $\xi = (\xi_1 + \xi_2)/2$ reduction of the ideal case. To investigate the scaling of phase sensitivity versus the average photon number n, we take the optimization over n_s under the constrain $n = n_c + n_s$. Using the large-n expansion, we find that

$$\Delta^2\phi = \left[\frac{\xi n}{1-\xi} + O(\sqrt{n})\right]^{-1}, \quad (19)$$

and the optimal value of n_s is $n_s = O(\sqrt{n}) \ll n$. We can see from Fig. 2(a) that in the presence of photon loss, the phase sensitivity approaches the SNL for large n. As a comparison, for the lossless case, we note that $n_s \simeq n/2$ and $\Delta\phi \simeq 1/n$.

For the practical cases, $n_s \ll n_c$ and $n \approx n_c$, we have the approximate QCRB,

$$\Delta^2\phi \simeq \left[\frac{\xi n}{1-\xi+\xi e^{-2r}}\right]^{-1}. \quad (20)$$

If the squeezing factor r is sufficiently large, i.e., $e^{2r} \gg \xi/(1-\xi)$, we further obtain $\Delta^2\phi \simeq (1-\xi)/(\xi n)$, which is just the optimal phase sensitivity in Eq. (19). As for the M-detection scheme, it effectively becomes a generalized homodyne detection,

$$M \propto p_2 + \frac{\sqrt{\xi_1}-\sqrt{\xi_2}}{\sqrt{\xi_1}+\sqrt{\xi_2}}p_1, \quad (21)$$

which reduces to p_2-detection for the balanced lossy arms $\xi_1 = \xi_2$ [17]. With this M-detection, the phase sensitivity yields Eq. (20). On the other hand, the phase sensitivity based on the p_2-detection is

$$\Delta^2\phi \simeq \left[\frac{\zeta n}{1-\zeta+\zeta e^{-2r}}\right]^{-1}, \quad (22)$$

where $\zeta = (\sqrt{\xi_1}+\sqrt{\xi_2})^2/4$. As shown in Fig. 2(b), for the unbalance lossy arms, the generalized homodyne detection gives better result than the simple p_2-detection and approaches Eq. (19) as $n_c \to \infty$. That is to say, in the presence of photon loss, the MZI with the practical coherent and squeezed vacuum state, plus the M-detection, performs nearly optimal. This generalizes the previously known results for the equal lossy arms in Refs. [18].

IV. PHASE SENSITIVITY IN THE $SU(1,1)$ INTERFEROMETER

To beat the SNL, Yurke *et al.* proposed a new type of interferometer in which the beam splitters of the traditional MZI is replaced with active four-port wave mixers [8]. Unlike the traditional MZI described by the $SU(2)$ group, this type of interferometer is described by the $SU(1,1)$ group. For the setup in Refs. [9], two OPAs replace two beam splitters in the traditional MZI. In Fig. 1(b), we slightly modify the setup in Refs. [9] by placing the traditional MZI between two OPAs in order to avoid the phase ambiguity discussed in Ref. [16]. The transformation between the input and output modes is then given by $\mathbf{a} \to T^-_{\rm OPA} T_{\rm MZI} T^+_{\rm OPA}\mathbf{a}$, where

$$T^{\pm}_{\rm OPA} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu & 0 & 0 & \pm\nu \\ 0 & \mu & \pm\nu & 0 \\ 0 & \pm\nu & \mu & 0 \\ \pm\nu & 0 & 0 & \mu \end{pmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

where $T^{\pm}_{\rm OPA}$ represent the actions of the OPAs. Here $\mu = \cosh g$, $\nu = \sinh g$, and g is the parametrical strength in the OPA process. Note that $T^-_{\rm OPA}T^+_{\rm OPA} = 1$. Thus in the absence of phase shift, the input equals the output.

We first consider the ideal $SU(1,1)$ interferometer. The QFI with the coherent input state $|\alpha\rangle_1|0\rangle_2$ is calculated as

$$F = G(G+2)(2n_c+1) + n_c, \quad (24)$$

where $G = 2\sinh^2 g$ is the spontaneous photon number emitted from the first OPA. We notice that Eq. (24) is different from the corresponding result in Ref. [17], because we used the symmetric phase shift between the two arms instead of the biased phase shift. Without the OPA process ($G = 0$), $F = n_c$ gives the SNL for a coherent state. For the vacuum input ($n_c = 0$), the state after the first OPA is the two-mode squeezed vacuum, and the QFI becomes $F = G(G+2)$. Because the average photon number inside the interferometer is just $n = G$, we have $\Delta\phi = 1/\sqrt{n(n+2)}$ [20]. However, due to technical limitations, $n_c \gg G$, the actual phase sensitivity becomes $\Delta^2\phi \simeq 1/(2n_cG^2)$ when the amplification of the input signal gets large, i.e., $G \gg 1$. So the phase sensitivity is improved by a factor of $2G^2$ compared with the SNL.

If we use $|\alpha\rangle_1|0,r\rangle_2$ as the input state, the QFI is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} F &= G(G+2)\left[n_c + (2n_s+1)(n_s+1)\right] \\ &\quad +(G+1)^2\left(n_c e^{2r} + n_s\right). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

We note that the average photon number inside the interferometer is given by $n = (G+1)(n_c+n_s) + G$. For the practical cases, $n_c \gg \max\{G, n_s\} \gg 1$, the QCRB



(a) (b)

FIG. 3: Loglog-plots of the phase sensitivity $\Delta\phi$ in the $SU(1,1)$ interferometer as a function of the average coherent photon number, $n_c = \alpha^2$. Solid: coherent and squeezed vacuum state; dashed: coherent state. As a comparison, the dot-dashed lines represent the results with a coherent and vacuum state into the MZI. The common parameters $G = 20$, $n_s = 10$. (a) $\xi = 1$; (b) $\xi = 0.8$.



(a) (b)

FIG. 4: The plots of QCRB in the presence of external photon loss. (a) The QCRB in the $SU(1,1)$ interferometer with $G = 20$. Dot-dashed: without the second OPA; Dashed: with the second OPA; Solid: ideal detector. (b) The QFI for a single-mode coherent-squeezed state with a large amplifier gain $G \gg 1$. The common parameters are $n_s = 20$ and $\xi = 0.8$.

becomes

$$\Delta^2\phi \simeq \frac{1}{4n_c n_s G^2}. \tag{26}$$

That is, the phase sensitivity is further enhanced by a factor of $2n_s$ with respect to the coherent input state. For the MZI with the same input state, the relevant phase sensitivity is $\Delta^2\phi \simeq 1/(4n_c n_s)$. Therefore, the $SU(1,1)$ interferometer performs better than the MZI by a factor of G^2 (see Fig. 3(a)).

Now we study the effects of photon loss on the $SU(1,1)$ interferometer. Following the similar steps as the MZI case, the QCRB for the lossy interferometer can be calculated. The numerical results are plotted in Fig. 3(b). It can be seen that for $\max\{G, n_s\} \gg 1$, and $n_c \to \infty$, we have

$$\Delta^2\phi \to \frac{1-\xi}{\xi n_c} \tag{27}$$

for the MZI with the input state $|\alpha\rangle_1|0,r\rangle_2$, and

$$\Delta^2\phi \to \frac{1-\xi_1}{\xi_1 n_c G} \tag{28}$$

for the $SU(1,1)$ interferometer with the input state $|\alpha\rangle_1|0\rangle_2$ or $|\alpha\rangle_1|0,r\rangle_2$. For the balanced lossy arms ($\xi_1 = \xi_2 = \xi$), both of them approach $\Delta^2\phi \to (1-\xi)/(\xi n)$, i.e., the fundamental lower bound of the phase sensitivity derived in Refs. [18]. This implies that replacing the second vacuum port with a squeezed vacuum is almost unnecessary for a lossy $SU(1,1)$ interferometer. Finally, the optimal M-detection is also approximately a homodyne detection.

V. EFFECTS OF EXTERNAL LOSS

In the previous sections we only consider the effects of photon loss to the environment insider the interferometer. Now we investigate the photon loss at the detectors, due to imperfect detectors [13, 14]. This external loss can also be modeled by a fictitious beam splitter as the internal loss, where the transmissivity parameter ξ_k is related to the detection inefficiency. Ignoring the internal photon loss and assuming $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = \xi$, the QFI for the input state, $|\alpha\rangle_1|0,r\rangle_2$, in the $SU(1,1)$ interferometer becomes

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \xi\Bigg\{\frac{G(G+2)}{2}\left[2n_c + \xi + \frac{(2n_s+1)^2\xi}{2n_s\xi(1-\xi)+1}\right] \\ &\quad +(G+1)^2\left(\frac{n_c}{1-\xi+\xi e^{-2r}} + n_s\right)\Bigg\}. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

For the ideal detector, $\xi = 1$, we get Eq. (25). For a vacuum input, $\alpha = r = 0$, $F = \xi^2 G(G+2)$, which reduces the ideal result by a factor of ξ^2. For the practical situations $n_c \gg \max\{G, n_s\} \gg 1$, $F \simeq \xi(2-\xi)n_c G^2/(1-\xi)$, which also means that the squeezed component of the input state is almost unnecessary. If the second OPA is not introduced, namely, $T_{\rm OPA}^- = 1$, the corresponding QCRB is plotted in Fig. 4(a) as a comparison. It indicates that the implement of the second OPA improves the phase sensitivity over that without the OPA before the final detection.

Next, we consider the following question: whether the effects of the detector inefficiency on the phase sensitivity can be effectively removed by an OPA (with gain G) before taking the final detection. For simplicity, a single-mode analog of the interferometer is invoked. We take a coherent-squeezed state, $|\alpha, r\rangle = e^{\alpha(a^\dagger - a)}e^{r(a^{\dagger 2} - a^2)/2}|0\rangle$, as the input to the phase shifter $T_\phi = e^{-i\phi a^\dagger a}$. Then an OPA is introduced by $T_{\rm OPA}^- = e^{g(a^2 - a^{\dagger 2})/2}$. At last, the external loss described by $\mathcal{L}a = a\sqrt{\xi} + v\sqrt{1-\xi}$ is applied. The combined transformation is thus given by

$$T_{\rm tot} = \mathcal{L}T_{\rm OPA}^- T_\phi \tag{30}$$

Our task is to optimize the corresponding QCRB over the adjustable parameters ϕ, G. We find that for a given ϕ, the relevant QFI is a increasing function of G. As

$G \to \infty$, we obtain

$$F \to 4\cos^2\phi \frac{\alpha^2 X + Y^2 - Y(\alpha^2 + Y)\cos 2\phi}{(X - Y\cos 2\phi)^2}. \quad (31)$$

The optimization of this QFI over ϕ is plotted in Fig. 4(b). We see that the QCRB in the presence of the external photon loss is always smaller than the ideal case. Only for some exceptional points, $\alpha = 0$ (squeezed vacuum state) and $r = 0$ (coherent state), they can be equal to $\Delta\phi = 1/(2\alpha)$ and $\sqrt{2}Y$, respectively [13, 14]. In other words, by increasing the amplifier gain, the effects of the detector inefficiency on the QCRB cannot be asymptotically canceled out for a generic coherent-squeezed state. Similar results can be obtained for the two-mode case.

VI. CONCLUSION

In summary, we have used the coherent and squeezed vacuum input state to study its optimal performances in the traditional MZI and the OPA-based MZI via the QCRB. Based on the SLD, we have explicitly constructed the detection schemes that gives the optimal phase sensitivities. Considering the technical limitations, we have shown that in the presence of photon loss, both of the interferometers with a proper homodyne detection are nearly optimal. Especially, we have generalized the previously known results for the equally lossy $SU(2)$ interferometer to those for the unequally lossy case. We have also found that the squeezed component of the input state in the lossy $SU(1,1)$ interferometer is effectively unnecessary. Finally, we have found that the effects of the detector inefficiency on the QCRB cannot be asymptotically canceled out for a generic coherent-squeezed state by increasing the amplifier gain of the OPA.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to acknowledge the support from NSFC Grand No. 11304265 and the Education Department of Henan Province (No. 12B140013).

[1] The LIGO Scientific Collaboration and the Virgo Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 061102 (2016).
[2] C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 1693 (1981).
[3] C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
[4] H. Lee, P. Kok, and J. P. Dowling, J. Mod. Opt. **49**, 2325 (2002).
[5] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 010401 (2006).
[6] L. Pezze and A Smerzi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 073601 (2008).
[7] M. D. Lang and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 173601 (2013).
[8] B. Yurke, S. L. McCall, and J. R. Klauder, Phys. Rev. A **33**, 4033 (1986).
[9] W. N. Plick, J. P. Dowling, and G. S. Agarwal, New J. Phys. **12**, 083014 (2010); C. Sparaciari, S. Olivares, M. G. A. Paris J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **32**, 1354 (2015).
[10] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3439 (1994).
[11] A. Monras, arXiv:1303.3682v1 (2013); Z. Jiang, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 032128 (2014); Y. Gao and H. Lee, Eur. Phys. J. D **68**, 347 (2014).
[12] W. N. Plick, P. M. Anisimov, J. P. Dowling, H. Lee, and G. S. Agarwal, New. J. Phys. **12**, 113025 (2010);
[13] N. Spagnolo, C. Vitelli, V. G. Lucivero, V. Giovannetti, L. Maccone, and F. Sciarrino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 233602 (2012).
[14] C. Sparaciari, S. Olivares, and M. G. A. Paris, Phys. Rev. A. **93**, 023810 (2016).
[15] J. P. Dowling, Contemp. Phys. **49**, 125 (2008).
[16] M. Jarzyna and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 011801(R) (2012)
[17] B. T. Gard, C. You, D. K. Mishra, R. Singh, H. Lee, T. R. Corbitt, and J. P. Dowling, arXiv:1605.03911v2 (2016).
[18] B. M. Escher, R. L. de Matos Filho, and L. Davidovich, Nature Phys. **7**, 406 (2011); R. Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, K. Banaszek, and R. Schnabel, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 041802(R) (2013).
[19] D. Li, B. T. Gard, Y. Gao, C. Yuan, W. Zhang, H. Lee, and J. P. Dowling, arXiv:1603.09019v2 (2016).
[20] P. M. Anisimov, G. M. Raterman, A. Chiruvelli, W. N. Plick, S. D. Huver, H. Lee, and J. P. Dowling Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 103602 (2010).